Background Paper

BP-279E

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE COURTS IN CANADA

Nancy Holmes
Law and Government Division

November 1991
Revised April 1992

Library of Parliament
Bibliothèque du Parlement

Research Branch

93-01894/

The Research Branch of the Library of Parliament works exclusively for Parliament, conducting research and providing information for Committees and Members of the Senate and the House of Commons. This service is extended without partisan bias in such forms as Reports, Background Papers and Issue Reviews. Research Officers in the Branch are also available for personal consultation in their respective fields of expertise.

©Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1992
Available in Canada through
your local bookseller
or by mail from
Canada Communication Group -- Publishing
Ottawa, Canada K1A OS9

Catalogue No. YM32-2/279-1992E
ISBN 0-660-14655-X

CE DOCUMENT EST AUSSI PUBLIÉ EN FRANÇAIS

CANADA

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE COURTS IN CANADA

INTRODUCTION

Although universally embraced in principle, the concept of "human rights" evades a precise definition and is subject to a general lack of consensus on how it should be approached. Certainly, the term "right," in and of itself, is ambiguous. It is sometimes applied in its strictest legal sense, where the right-holder is entitled to something which another has a corresponding duty to provide. In other cases, a "right" indicates an immunity from interference. To speak of human rights, then, requires a conception of rights possessed simply by virtue of being human. Some generalizations can be made in this regard. Human rights tend to represent individual and group demands for access to wealth and power and for mutual respect. These rights are both legally and morally justifiable, and they apply to all persons simply because they are human beings. Most rights are qualified or limited in some way, usually on the basis that with the privilege of rights comes the responsibility to tolerate the rights of others. Finally, human rights are commonly priorized as either fundamental or non-fundamental.

It is important to understand that the protection of human rights is a field of public policy, although it is not always recognized as such. Controversies about human rights usually involve the question of whether priority should be given to individuals' personal claims or to their responsibilities to others. These issues are rarely resolved by applying traditional legal principles. Rather, what is really involved is policy-making. Protecting human rights requires ongoing comparisons of legitimate objectives. The public policy of human rights has tended to

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHEQUE DU PARLEMENT

divide these rights into four broad categories: (1) political rights, which traditionally include freedom of association, assembly, expression, the press, conscience and religion; (2) legal rights, which include equality before the law, due process of the law, freedom from arbitrary arrest, right to a fair hearing, and access to counsel; (3) economic rights, which include the right to own property and freedom of contract; and (4) egalitarian rights, which include the right to employment, education, accommodation, facilities and services without discrimination on the basis of race, origin, age or sex.

How a political system can best protect human rights depends to a large extent on variables specific to time and culture. Canada's particular approach has been a mix of the British liberal tradition of relying on ordinary law and elected parliaments, and the American liberal tradition, which places reliance on a written constitution and judicial review. In order to reflect adequately the different sets of mechanisms used to protect human rights in Canada, it is useful to divide the Canadian experience into three time periods.

During the first period, from Confederation to 1960, the federal and provincial legislatures had the primary responsibility for safeguarding the human rights principles inherited from the United Kingdom. The judiciary played only a minor role through its responsibility for upholding the common law principles that had developed to protect these rights. Despite the existence of legal bases for action, the courts and the legislatures both evidenced a general reluctance to address issues of human rights except as a peripheral matter. The second period began with the advent of the *Canadian Bill of Rights* and the enactment of human rights codes at both the provincial and federal level. During this time period, the courts were therefore expressly invited by the legislatures to take on a more active role in settling controversial human rights issues. The invitation was, however, basically rejected. It was not until the third period, beginning in 1982 with the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, that the judiciary was accorded the constitutional mandate it had felt was necessary to rule on the substantive validity of legislation, as it has now begun to do to ensure compliance with the rights and freedoms granted by the Charter.

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

FROM CONFEDERATION TO THE BILL OF RIGHTS

At the time of Confederation, it was decided that Canada would adopt the parliamentary form of government that had evolved in the United Kingdom. One of the dominant principles underlying that system was the doctrine of parliamentary supremacy, which held that the legislative branch of the government could determine the powers of the other two branches: the executive and the judiciary. Canada inherited this principle of legislative supremacy by way of the preamble to the *British North America Act*, now referred to as the *Constitution Act, 1867*. This stated that Canada would have a constitution "similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom." This meant that the Canadian Constitution embraced the elements of the unwritten British constitution, including the notions of the rule of law and parliamentary supremacy. Legislative supremacy could not, however, apply in Canada exactly as it did in the United Kingdom; as Canada was a federal country, no single legislature was supreme. Instead, the federal and provincial legislatures were supreme only within constitutionally designated areas of jurisdiction.

The *Constitution Act, 1867* also made provision for the establishment of a federally-appointed judiciary charged not only with the traditional judicial tasks of settling disputes between individuals and interpreting statutes with a view to the intent of the legislators, but with a third task arising out of the new country's federal nature - adjudication on the constitutional division of powers between the federal and provincial legislatures. Thus, at the time of Confederation, the relationship between the courts and the other branches of government was clearly defined. The federal and provincial legislatures made the law, the executive implemented and enforced the law and the judiciary was responsible only for interpreting the law that the others had made and enforced. Moreover, until 1949, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, rather than the Supreme Court of Canada, served as Canada's final court of appeal.

The *Constitution Act, 1867* makes no specific reference to human rights or fundamental liberties. While section 92(13) accords the

RECYCLED RECYCLE

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

provincial legislatures the power to make laws affecting "property and civil rights," there is no reference to any civil rights of individuals. The Act does guarantee some group rights with respect to the establishment and operation of schools by Roman Catholic or Protestant minorities and with respect to the use of the English and French languages; however, it is fair to say that these guarantees saw little in the way of judicial enforcement until quite recently. It was the opinion of some jurists by the beginning of the twentieth century that the preamble to the Act bestowed on Canadians the benefits of the tradition of civil liberties that had developed in the United Kingdom before 1867 and which formed part of that country's unwritten constitution. As will be seen, however, the courts were reluctant to interpret the Constitution in this way when it was not clear that such had been the intent of its framers and when the principle of parliamentary supremacy had by that time taken on almost sacred proportions.

As a rule then, judges in this period felt that they were powerless to prevent legislative violations of human rights unless the law that caused the violation offended the federal division of powers. In 1899, for example, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London struck down a British Columbia law that prohibited anyone of Chinese origin from working in mines on the basis that the provincial law interfered with federal jurisdiction over "naturalization and aliens." On the other hand, the Judicial Committee upheld British Columbia legislation that denied the vote to Canadians of Asiatic origin as being within the proper bounds of provincial jurisdiction. In both instances, the Judicial Committee noted that, in accordance with the principle of legislative supremacy, judges could not consider the policy or impolicy of such enactments.

The courts were more than content to leave all policy decisions to the legislatures, even in those areas untouched by Parliament and which had been subject to purely judge-made, or so-called "common law." Without express legislative direction, the courts were not prepared to find human rights violations to be either immoral or illegal. Thus, in the area of race discrimination, the Supreme Court of Canada consistently advanced the principles of freedom of commerce and contract, no matter how flagrant

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

the discriminatory result. In *Christie* v. *York Corporation,* [1940] S.C.R. 139, a black man who had been refused service in a tavern claimed damages for humiliation on the basis of the common law of tort. The Supreme Court dismissed the man's claim and held that, on the basis of the principle of freedom of commerce, merchants are free to deal as they choose with an individual member of the public. In that same year, the British Columbia Court of Appeal also held that anyone "may conduct a business in the manner best suited to advance his own interests," even if that meant discriminating against patrons solely because of their race or colour.

Beginning in the 1930s, however, some judges attempted to use the preamble to the Constitution as a means of establishing a new route, over and above the established common law, for protecting human rights in Canada. In the *Alberta Press Bill* case, the Supreme Court of Canada was asked by the federal government to determine the validity of a package of legislation enacted by the Social Credit government of Alberta to bring the province out of the Depression. Part of the legislation granted a government agency, the Social Credit Board, the power to prohibit the publication of a newspaper, to force a newspaper to print corrections of articles that the Board considered inaccurate, and to prohibit newspapers from publishing articles written by certain blacklisted persons. The rationale behind this portion of the legislation was that the monetary reforms of the legislation as a package would work only if the people believed in them. The Supreme Court unanimously determined the matter on a jurisdictional or division-of-powers basis, finding the legislation to be outside the powers of the provincial legislature because it invaded the federal government's jurisdiction over banking, interest and legal tender. What is significant about the Court's decision, however, is that three of the justices also perceived the legislation as being contrary to the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press.

Chief Justice Duff based his civil liberties argument on the fact that the preamble to the *Constitution Act, 1867* implanted in Canada the civil liberties principles of the United Kingdom, including freedom of the press and freedom of speech. Moreover, because the Constitution establishes the House of Commons as an elected and representative body,

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

intended to work under the influence of public opinion and discussion, freedom of the press is an essential component of the principle of democracy.

The problem with the so-called "Duff Doctrine" was it could not be squared with the doctrine of legislative supremacy. As a result, it was not endorsed by the majority of the Court. The acceptance of a legally enforceable implied bill of rights would have meant a major restructuring of the Canadian political system. It would have meant recognizing constitutional principles of the United Kingdom, as enforced by judges. Such a judicial enforcement of civil liberties could ultimately have limited the powers of the legislatures and called into question the whole notion of legislative supremacy. Moreover, because an implied bill of rights would consist of abstract principles and judicial decisions about the nature of these abstractions, it would be even less clear than a written bill of rights. The Canadian judiciary at this time was naturally reluctant to embark on such a bold and uncharted course. Instead, the Supreme Court of Canada, even as the final court of appeal in Canada after 1949, ruled in favour of civil liberties claims only on the basis of the division of legislative powers.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS ERA

In the aftermath of the Second World War, human rights became a central issue of concern both at the international and the domestic level. Not only had Canadians witnessed atrocities abroad, but the suspension of human rights for Canadians of Japanese origin, the confiscation of their property and their forced internment during the war had had a profound consciousness-raising effect on the people of Canada with respect to the issue of human rights. It is worth looking at the more important international human rights documents that developed after the war, because their impact on domestic legislation and practice in this area cannot be overstated.

The reality of the crimes committed by the Nazi régime during the course of World War II was a catalyst for the United Nations

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

adoption of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948. The principal aim of the document was to set out, in general language, the basic rights to which all human beings ought to be entitled. Among the rights proclaimed are the right to life, liberty and security of the person, the right to privacy, the right to own property, and the freedoms of expression, movement, conscience, and peaceful assembly. Although, as its name indicates, the Universal Declaration was intended simply as a declaratory document not binding on members of the United Nations, it has achieved the status of customary international law and, as such, it has served to provide both the inspiration and starting point for the numerous international human rights documents that have followed.

In 1966, the United Nations General Assembly supplemented the Universal Declaration with three additional documents: the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, and the *Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. Together, these documents are collectively known as the International Bill of Human Rights. The primary effect of the 1966 instruments was to elaborate and extend the rights expressed in the Universal Declaration and to establish machinery for their enforcement through the United Nations. Canada was an active leader in these human rights developments at the international level, and it has since made serious efforts to ensure that such rights are protected domestically.

As a result of the emerging public awareness of the need for human rights safeguards in Canada, and the judiciary's obvious reluctance to take a stand on these issues, it fell to the legislatures of the federal and provincial governments to bring the country's domestic law into line with its recent international commitments. As noted earlier, the area of human rights was not specifically catalogued under the division of legislative powers set out in the *Constitution Act, 1867*. The closest the Act came to providing for this area seems to be the federal power with respect to "peace, order and good government" in section 91, and the provincial power over "property and civil rights" in section 92. In view of this overlapping jurisdiction, both levels of government entered the field

CYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

of human rights, although the initiative was principally taken at the provincial level.

The first human rights statute of the contemporary era was the Ontario *Racial Discrimination Act* of 1944, which prohibited the publication, display or broadcast of anything indicating an intention to discriminate on the basis of race or creed. The significance of this pioneering statute is that, for the first time, a legislature explicitly declared that racial and religious discrimination was against public policy, so that the judiciary could not simply subordinate human rights to the interests of commerce, contract or property. In 1947, the Province of Saskatchewan enacted the first bill of rights in Canada, which, in addition to anti-discrimination provisions, also proclaimed such political liberties as the right to vote, freedom of religion, speech and press, assembly and association, and freedom from arbitrary arrest or detention. The major drawback to this ambitious statute, however, was the lack of an effective enforcement procedure. The *Saskatchewan Bill of Rights* was followed by the enactment in various provinces of fair employment and fair practices legislation, which contained enforcement mechanisms, though not full-time staff to administer them. The combined effect of this legislation was to serve as the prototype for modern provincial human rights codes.

At the federal level, Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, a civil liberties advocate, was convinced that Canada needed a national bill of rights that would have a superior status to other laws. Unfortunately, he was unable to obtain the broad provincial consensus required to entrench such a bill in the Constitution. Instead, he was forced to settle for a bill that was an ordinary enactment of Parliament and which applied only to matters under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Diefenbaker believed, however, that because of its very nature the courts would use such a bill to nullify federal legislation that conflicted with its provisions.

The *Bill of Rights*, which was enacted in 1960, is a relatively straightforward document. Section 1 guarantees the right to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, unless deprived thereof by due process of the law; the right to equality before

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

the law and the protection of the law; and the freedoms of religion, speech, assembly, association and the press. Moreover, it provides that these rights and freedoms are to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex.

Section 2 of the *Bill of Rights* guarantees a number of rights that had already been developed by judges through the common law to protect the civil liberties of an individual when confronted with the judicial system. For example, all Canadians have the right not to be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned. No one can be arrested or detained without knowing the reason, and detainees have the right to retain a lawyer without delay. Section 2 also confirms the right to a fair hearing in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. Finally, the section contains a "notwithstanding" clause, which provides that every law of Canada shall, unless expressly declared otherwise, be construed and applied so as not to abrogate any of the rights or freedoms recognized in the *Bill of Rights*.

The problem faced by the judiciary was how, in a system of legislative supremacy, an ordinary statute like the *Bill of Rights* could take precedence over other ordinary statutes, particularly those enacted after it. Indeed, the judiciary made it quite clear that it felt a great deal of uncertainty about applying the statute because it did not constitute a constitutional mandate to make judicial decisions with the effect of limiting the traditional sovereignty of Parliament. In fact, with only one notable exception, the courts consistently rendered the *Bill of Rights* ineffective in the promotion and protection of human rights in Canada. Often, it was determined that the *Bill of Rights* did not apply to a particular case on the basis that the rights it could protect were only those that had existed at the time of its enactment. In other words, the courts gave an extremely narrow interpretation, often referred to as the "frozen rights concept," to the rights set out in the *Bill of Rights*. In other cases, the courts simply refused to find any inconsistency between its provisions and discriminatory provisions in federal legislation, particularly as the legislation at issue was usually based on a valid federal objective with which the courts felt they had no right to interfere.

CYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

It is not surprising, then, that at the same time as the courts were giving short shrift to the federal *Bill of Rights,* there was a flourishing of provincial human rights legislation, the administration and application of which was largely taken out of the hands of the courts and confined to administrative agencies in the form of human rights commissions and tribunals. The first human rights code to consolidate various anti-discrimination provisions was adopted by Ontario in 1962. The Act prohibited discrimination on the grounds of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin, and it established a commission and a full-time staff to administer and enforce the law. The other nine provinces and two territories soon enacted similar legislation. In 1977, the federal government enacted the *Canadian Human Rights Act,* which had strictly federal jurisdiction.

While there is today some diversity among jurisdictions, the principles and enforcement mechanisms of human rights legislation in Canada are essentially the same. Each Act prohibits discrimination on specified grounds (such as race, sex, age and religion) in respect of employment, accommodation and publicly available services. The system is complaint-based in that a complaint must be lodged with a human rights commission or council either by a person who believes that he or she has been discriminated against, or by the commission itself on the basis of its own investigation. If a complaint is determined to be well founded, the commission generally attempts to conciliate the difference between the complainant and the respondent. Where conciliation fails, a tribunal may be formed to hear the case and make a binding decision.

Despite the tremendous success of human rights commissions in dealing with cases of discrimination, their jurisdiction is severely limited and they are essentially self-contained in the sense that their findings are enforceable only by means of special procedures and remedies set out in the legislation itself, and not by ordinary recourse through the court system. As recently as 1981, the Supreme Court of Canada, still conditioned to looking to the legislature for the ultimate answer, affirmed this restrictive nature of human rights codes and thereby continued to lay the burden of policy-making on the legislature. In the case of *Board of*

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

Governors of Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology v. *Bhadauria* (1981), 124 D.L.R. (3d) 193, the Court held that the *Ontario Human Rights Code* must be interpreted as having been intended to restrict the enforcement of its discrimination prohibitions to the measures established by the Code itself, and not to vest any supplementary enforcement responsibility in the courts. The decision effectively eliminated the argument that the very existence of anti-discrimination legislation meant that discrimination, in and of itself, could constitute a civil action for damages before the courts.

Therefore, despite the tremendous legislative initiative dealing with rights violations, the system of human rights law in Canada developed in a peculiarly de-centralized manner. Even with the establishment of a national *Bill of Rights*, the refusal by the courts in any way to weaken the political principle of legislative supremacy, effectively denied Canadians the benefit of a universally applicable human rights statute.

THE ADVENT OF THE CHARTER

By virtue of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, the British Parliament ceased to have authority to legislate for Canada; however, perhaps the most significant element of this historic document is the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, which guarantees Canadians fundamental rights and freedoms. While the Charter represents a culmination of the Canadian trend away from the British approach of an unwritten constitution as the preferred method of protecting fundamental freedoms, a trend which began with the adoption of the statutory *Bill of Rights*, it is important to note that most of the Charter rights were already protected by statute or common law prior to 1982. What is significant, then, is the enhanced legal status which the Charter accords these rights simply by placing them in an entrenched constitution. Moreover, section 52 of the *Constitution Act, 1982* expressly states that "The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada and any law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is, to the extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect." Thus, the Charter expressly

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

modified the tradition of parliamentary supremacy with the principle of constitutional supremacy and thereby ushered in a whole new era of judicial review.

Thus, in 1982, the Canadian courts finally received a clear mandate not only to determine whether the laws passed by federal and provincial legislative bodies violate the rights and freedoms granted by the Charter, but to strike down those which do not conform to the Charter's precepts. The question remains, however, to what extent the courts will use their new role to alter the doctrine of parliamentary supremacy and even the structure of federalism itself. In order to answer this question properly, it is useful to study the rulings of the Supreme Court of Canada, as it is this court that generally sets the tone for the entire judicial system.

During the first years of the Court's treatment of the Charter, a clear signal was sent out that the Charter was to be given a large and liberal interpretation. The Court emphasized that the task of interpreting a constitution was crucially different from that of construing a statute such as the *Bill of Rights*. In *Hunter* v. *Southam Inc.*, [1984] 2 S.C.R. 145, Chief Justice Dickson urged his fellow judges "not to read the provisions of the Constitution like a last will and testament lest it become one." Charter interpretation, according to the Chief Justice, must be generous rather than legalistic. These words were equally matched by a boldness of decision-making. For example, while section 32 of the Charter declared that its provisions applied to all matters within the authority of Parliament and the legislatures of the provinces, the Court in the 1985 *Operation Dismantle* case embraced a broad concept of judicial review in its scrutiny of the federal Cabinet's decision to allow the testing of the cruise missile over Canadian territory. While the Court held that the executive branch of the Canadian government has a duty to act in accordance with the dictates of the Charter, no violation of Charter rights was established in this case. As well, in the area of legal rights, the Court used the Charter to alter the Canadian criminal process away from a "crime control" model to a more "due process" approach that protected the rights of the accused.

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

Perhaps the height of the non-interpretive approach adopted by the Court in the first years of the Charter was reached in the case of *Reference Re Section 94(2) of the Motor Vehicle Act*, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 486. In that case, the Court dealt with section 7 of the Charter, which guarantees the right to life, liberty and security of the person, and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. The Court held that the principles of fundamental justice embraced a substantive as well as a procedural due process requirement. Thus, an element of mental intent is constitutionally required for any offence for which the accused could be liable to the punishment of imprisonment. This meant that punishment of an offence automatically on the basis of the act alone, without evidence of intent, was unconstitutional. This decision ultimately had broad implications for the crime of murder, which had traditionally included acts wherein the accused must either have foreseen, or ought to have foreseen, death as a probable, though unintentional, result.

Finally, it is worth noting that the Court's initial nullification of 19 pieces of legislation by way of the Charter is in sharp contrast with the Court's prior exercise of deferential judicial review under the *Bill of Rights*, pursuant to which the Court struck down only part of one statute, in fact an obscure section of the *Indian Act*. Therefore, not only were the judges of the Supreme Court strongly activist in the first few years of the Charter, but in virtually all cases they were also unanimous.

After about 1985, the Court appeared to divide into two wings. The activist wing continued to give broad and generous interpretations to Charter rights, while the other wing adhered to the philosophy of deferring to the legislators and therefore tended to limit the overall reach of the Charter. With a considerable change in the composition of the Court after 1989, it would appear that a growing sense of caution and judicial self-restraint is permeating the Court as a whole in its approach to the Charter. A good illustration of this emerging trend is found in the Court's 1990 decision on mandatory retirement. One of the issues in this case was the extent to which statutory limits on the

RECYCLED · RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

prohibition of age discrimination in the *Ontario Human Rights Code* violated the equality guarantees of the Charter. The Court had no hesitation in finding that the particular provisions of the Code violated section 15 of the Charter. The Court went on, however, to uphold the legislation, pursuant to section 1 of the Charter, on the basis that the age limitation is demonstrably justified. The Court pointed out that the courts should not lightly use the Charter to second-guess legislative judgment as to how quickly it should proceed towards the ideal of equality.

In assessing the recent changes in the Court, it is useful to keep in mind the nature of judicial policy-making that is involved under the Charter. Essentially the courts make human rights policies in two ways. The first is to define the specific content of the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Charter. For example, it must be determined whether "freedom of association" contains a right to strike; whether the "right to life" covers a fetus: and whether the "right to equality" prohibits systemic discrimination. Secondly, the courts must decide whether a government objective that violates a right, once it is defined, can be considered justified pursuant to section 1 of the Charter. Section 1 applies to all rights and freedoms under the Charter and subjects them to "such reasonable limitations prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society." Therefore, section 1 involves a highly discretionary balancing test between the policy interests of the government and the interest in the Charter litigant in having his or her rights upheld. It is important to recognize that section 1 represents one of two concessions to parliamentary sovereignty under the Charter. The second is section 33 ("the notwithstanding clause"), which permits the federal and provincial legislatures to enact laws which violate some, but not all, of the rights and freedoms enumerated by the Charter, but only for maximum periods of five years.

As a result of the Charter, the Supreme Court now routinely finds itself struggling to weigh and balance policy interests, something very new to the judicial forum and something the judges feel ill-equipped to do. As this paper is written, the Court is still seeking to establish some kind of equilibrium between its own role and that of the elected legislatures.

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

CONCLUSION

As a result of a federal structure with a division of legislative powers, plus a constitutional revision in 1982, human rights in Canada are entrenched in the Constitution as well as safeguarded in legislation at the federal, provincial and territorial levels. The creation of the Charter did not eliminate existing human rights legislation or diminish its importance. To the contrary, not only does the Charter itself in section 26 guarantee the continuation of existing rights and freedoms in Canada, but the advent of the Charter also had the profound effect of freeing the courts from the constraint of the doctrine of parliamentary supremacy in the interpretation and enforcement of human rights statutes. In the post-Charter era, both the *Bill of Rights* and federal and provincial human rights legislation were given "quasi-constitutional" status by the Supreme Court and this served to place them above ordinary legislation.

Thus, the *Bill of Rights* continues in force in Canada and its importance lies in those provisions which the Charter does not duplicate - for example, the right to the enjoyment of property (section 1(a)). Federal and provincial human rights statutes also continue to play a significant role in the promotion and protection of human rights because they are concerned with private acts of discrimination, whereas the application of the Charter is limited to governmental action. However, because human rights legislation is law, the reach of the Charter may well extend to private acts of discrimination through judicial interpretations of the prohibited grounds of discrimination and any statutory exceptions to such prohibitions found in these statutes. Moreover, just as decisions rendered under the Charter will be used in human rights hearings, so too will human rights decisions be used in interpreting the Charter. While it may seem odd to speak of the effect of a federal or provincial statute on a document such as the Charter, human rights legislation like the *Bill of Rights* has a history of significant decisions that can be useful tools in Charter interpretation.

Therefore, the combined mechanisms of the Charter, the *Bill of Rights* and federal and provincial human rights laws, in conjunction with

RECYCLED · RECYCLÉ

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

the expanded role of the courts, today provide Canadians with a comprehensive scheme of human rights promotion and protection.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Cholewinski, Ryszard I., ed. *Human Rights in Canada: Into the 1990s and Beyond*. Human Rights Research and Education Centre, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, 1990.

Greene, Ian. *The Charter of Rights*. James Lorimer & Company, Toronto, 1989.

Mandel, Michael. *The Charter of Rights and the Legalization of Politics in Canada*. Wall & Thompson, Toronto, 1989.

McLachlin, Beverly M. "The Role of the Court in the Post-Charter Era: Policy-Maker or Adjucator." 39 *University of New Brunswick Law Journal* 43, 1989.

Morton, F.L. "The Political Impact of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, XX:1, March 1987, p. 31.

Pentney, William F. *Discrimination and the Law*. De Boo Publishers, Don Mills, 1990.

RECYCLED RECYCLÉ